

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 2, 2005. Claims 22-31 and 52-70 are now present in this case. Claims 62, 63, and 70 have been amended.

The Office Action contains an objection to the Abstract as exceeding the word limit. A new Abstract is enclosed.

It appears that claims 22-31 and 52-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. However, the Office Action does not specify which subsection is appropriate and, furthermore, appears to analyze the claims under an obviousness standard. Indeed, page 2 indicates that the claims are “rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being anticipated by Picard et al.” (See Office Action, page 2.) The Office Action appears to describe an anticipation rejection of claim 52, but concludes with an incomplete sentence stating that “Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate.” (See Office Action, page 4.) For these reasons, the applicants are unclear as to the true nature of the rejection. However, for purposes of responding to the Office Action, the applicants will address the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 52 recites a system for delivering information to a subscriber wherein the messaging platform converts information to have a delivery format corresponding to a delivery format selected by the subscriber. The section of Picard cited in the Office Action does not teach or suggest such a system. As noted in Picard, messages are converted into a format corresponding to the message type, but not corresponding to a delivery format selected by the subscriber. For example, Picard states that for voice messages, the voice data is converted into a file for playing by conventional audio application while facsimile and text messages are converted into a tiff file and video messages are converted into an avi, mpg, mpeg, cu, etc. file formats. (See column 16, lines 19-31.) The portion of Picard cited in the Office Action provides no teaching or even suggestion that a subscriber selects the delivery format. For these reasons, among others, claim 52 is clearly allowable over Picard. Claims 53-61 are also allowable in view of the fact that they depend from claim 52, and further in view of the recitation within each of those claims.

The Office Action, at page 5, states that claims 22-31 and 62-67 contain “the similar limitations set forth of the apparatus claims 52-61.” This is not correct. It should be noted that the independent claims 22, 52, 62, and 70 are each directed to different aspects for delivering information to a subscriber on a messaging system.

With respect to claim 22, the method includes providing a mailbox ID and service information including an information type, a delivery period, and a delivery format. While Picard describes the use of a mailbox ID and password, the cited section provides no teaching or suggestion of the delivery of service information including an information type, delivery period, and delivery format, as recited in claim 22. For these reasons, among others, claim 22, and dependent claims 23-31 are clearly allowable over Picard.

Claim 62 is directed to a messaging network in which a master platform coupled to a communication network is configured to receive a request message from the first of a plurality of messaging platforms wherein the request message includes a request for information. An information source outside the communication network is coupled to the master platform and configured to receive the request for information and to respond to the request with a response message. In turn, the master platform is further configured to receive the response message and to transmit the response message to the first of the plurality of messaging platforms. Among other things, Picard does not teach or even suggest an information source outside the communication network receiving and responding to request messages. At best, Picard discloses a message system in which a master control unit accesses messages stored within the messaging network and forwards them to a subscriber. There is no suggestion of a subscriber message being relayed to an information source outside the communication network or the information source responding to the request message, as recited in claim 62. Accordingly, claim 62 and dependent claims 63-69 are clearly allowable over Picard.

Claim 70 is a system claim in which a messaging computer has a communication module configured to receive a mailbox ID and service information from a subscriber and to communicate with a master messaging computer communication module. The messaging computer communicates a request to the master messaging

computer corresponding to the service information. In turn, the master messaging computer is configured to communicate with an information source to receive information from the information source corresponding to the request and is further configured to convert the information to have a delivery format corresponding to a delivery format selected by the subscriber. As discussed above, Picard converts data to a system selected format based on the file type, but does not teach or suggest converting information to a delivery format selected by the subscriber. For these reasons, among others, claim 70 is clearly allowable over Picard.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7640.

Respectfully submitted,

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP



Michael J. Donohue
Registration No. 35,859

MJD:gatc

2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 628-7699

1653215_1.DOC 67771-4